

REMARKS

Status of Claims

The Office Action mailed May 23, 2006 has been reviewed and the comments of the Patent and Trademark Office have been considered. Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-15, 18-20, 22, 24-26, and 28-33 are pending in the application and are resubmitted for consideration by the examiner.

Prior Art Rejections

Claims 1, 4-6, 9, 12-14, 18-20, 24-26, 29, 32, 33, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin (hereafter "IBM Bulletin") and further in view of U.S. patent 5,446,883 to Kirkbride et al. (hereafter "Kirkbride"). Claims 2, 15, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over IBM and Kirkbride, further in view of U.S. patent 6,393,442 to Cromarty et al. (hereafter "Cromarty"). Claims 8, 10, 11, 25, 30, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over IBM and Kirkbride further in view of U.S. patent 6,519,571 to Guheen et al. (hereafter "Guheen"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for at least the following reasons.

With respect to the pending independent claims 1, 14, and 20, as acknowledged in the office action, the IBM Bulletin does not disclose the combination of (1) automatic triggering of a propagation of a predetermined event on the node set, to a registered partner, over a global network, and (2) wherein the predetermined event is an update of the node set that is derived from a document previously sent by the trading partner. In order to cure this deficiency of the IBM Bulletin, the office action relies on the newly cited Kirkbride reference.

Kirkbride relates to distributed call management for an expert system, where the expert system is used to solve recurring problems. See column 1, lines 14-60. However, Kirkbride has nothing to do with "parsing said received document ... into a constituent node set." Kirkbride has nothing to do with "semantically-tagging, indexing and storing the node set." Kirkbride has nothing to do with "automatically triggering a propagation of a predetermined event on the node set ... wherein the predetermined event is an update of the node set." Rather, Kirkbride provides a notification of an update to users who have an interest in a solution document not of a node set, but rather the document itself.

“Notify link register 28 records the mapping between user table register 25 and the incident solution in acyclic graph data base 27. This linkage maintains a list of all users who have an interest in a specific document, enabling notification of users when a change or update to the document is created. Problem link register 29 connects the contents of incident table register 23 to corresponding solution documents in acyclic graph data base 27. This linkage is useful to the system administrator for showing which solution documents were retrieved for various incidents or problems posed to inquiry computer 10. One example of the use of this linkage would be if a non-optimal solution document was continually being retrieved for a recurring problem or incident. Recognizing this pattern from the data stored in problem link register 29, the data owner could take action to either improve the solution document or restructure acyclic graph paths 36 so that a more useful solution to the given problem is found.” Column 4, lines 29-47.

Kirkbride has nothing to do with automatically triggering the propagation to trading partners (over a global commerce network) of a predetermined event that is an update of a node set derived from a previously sent document from a trading partner.

See, for example, paragraphs 71-72 and 74-77 in the specification with respect to support for these claimed features in the specification. These features provide the advantage that related or *registered trading partners* are *automatically* updated when any *changes* are made to a node set. See paragraph 79 for these advantages.

Thus, neither the IBM TDB or Kirkbride disclose the triggering event being not an update to the document, but rather an update to the node set.

Therefore, the office action fails to make a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to the independent claims as required by section 103.

The dependent claims are also patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims on which they ultimately depend. They also recite additional limitations for their patentability when considered as a whole. See in particular claims 12 and 32

“appending at least one node of said node set of
said received second document to said document
previously stored in said data store,”

and claims 13 and 33

“further comprising triggering a propagation of an
event to the registered partner, over the global commerce

network, by the storing or appending of at least one of said nodes of said second document stored in said data store.”

which are not disclosed or suggested by either reference.

Conclusion

In view of the above, applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. An early notice of the same is respectfully solicited. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

Should additional fees be necessary in connection with the filing of this paper, or if a petition for extension of time is required for timely acceptance of same, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge deposit account No. 19-0741 for any such fees; and applicant hereby petitions for any needed extension of time.

Respectfully submitted,

Date July 17, 2006

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP

Customer Number: 22428

Telephone: (202) 672-5485

Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By



William T. Ellis

Registration No. 26,874

Attorneys for Applicant